

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

14th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XIV, Number 17

P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015

October 15, 1984

Below the Campaign Threshold

Reagan-Mondale: The Differences on R&D Issues

Sleaze, religion, procreation, and, most recently, geriatrics have figured in the presidential election campaign, but except for Walter Mondale's vague suggestions during last week's debate for spending more on science, the research community and its issues have gone virtually uncourted.

Some would say that this is as it should be, that the omission merely reflects the apolitical nature of the American scientific enterprise, and that the absence of contention over science policy and spending means that research has indeed risen above politics. No doubt there

Keyworth on Small Business Research, Social Science, and Russian R&D—Page 5

is a great deal of overlap on research policies between the Reagan Administration and what might be expected of a Mondale Administration. But, along with the similarities, there are differences that merit notice, even if an assessment of Mondale's policies in this area must necessarily be speculative.

The main reason that science has not figured prominently in presidential politics is that bread-and-butter issues that concern scientists are too obscure for the general public and there aren't enough scientists to warrant a special pursuit of their votes. But the current campaign is the quietest in many years on the subject of research-related matters, not even boasting any conspicuous versions of the scientists and engineers for this or that candidate that have quadrennially sprouted since 1960, particularly on the Democratic side. What accounts for the present season's lack of political ardor in the ranks of science?

The answer is money, heaps of which have been flowing for the past three years from Washington's research-supporting agencies to university laboratories and industrial research contractors. The intent wasn't to buy them off politically. Rather, the flow originated in the Reagan Administration dogma that the support of science is a sacred obligation of the federal government because science is seen as indispensable for defense and industrial rejuvenation, and there's no one there but the federal government to provide massive support. But, regardless of the absence of intent, the effect has been

pacifying, if only through the process of keeping people professionally occupied.

Since both the Democratic House and the Republican Senate share the Administration's faith in science, and then some, the effect has been a huge growth of federal support for large sectors of the scientific community, including several that previously have been homebase for electoral activism. It would be fruitless for Mondale to promise a rescue operation for academic science, the space establishment, or defense-supported research, because they're all doing quite well under an R&D budget that's up by 14 percent for the fiscal year that just started, to a record high of \$52 billion.

Included in that huge sum is \$1.5 billion requested
(Continued on page 3)

In Brief

Congress has finally gone along with long-running campaigns to add two institutes to the 11 now at the National Institutes of Health—the National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases and the National Institute of Nursing. Both were backed by strong lobbies and opposed by the NIH leadership and its medical school allies, which regard new institutes as narrowly focused grabs at the budget. Bethesda's best hopes are now for a presidential veto.

The Institute of Nursing, which is conceived as a health-services-delivery research center, was opposed as incompatible with NIH's mission in basic biomedical research. But touted as a women's issue, it roused few Congressional opponents in this election year.

The Department of Agriculture's competitive-grants program is going into the new fiscal year with a record high budget—\$46 million, an increase of \$27 million over last year. Senate-House agreement on the new budget represents a major fiscal breakthrough for the USDA program, which House Appropriations Chairman Jamie L. Whitten (D-Miss.) had annually squelched as a threat to research on current agricultural problems. The budget contains \$20 million for biotechnology research, an area into which the Department is being prodded by the White House Science Office.

Bring Money and Join Us, NASA Head Tells Europe

The following excerpts are from remarks by NASA Administrator James M. Beggs in response to questions following a talk he gave October 9 at the Georgetown University Center for Strategic and International Studies.

On European participation in the US program to build a permanently manned space station: What we've said is that if you bring money, we would love to have you. We've asked them for quite a sizable piece of money. We've said that we're going to spend about \$8 billion, in '82 economics . . . We've asked the European Space Agency to consider an investment of about \$2 billion and the Japanese to consider . . . \$1 billion. I watched them very closely. They didn't blink. But they have all the same budgetary pressures that everyone else does, and whether they come up with that amount of money—but we will be happy to welcome them for whatever they feel they can afford to invest in the venture, and they will participate in accordance with their investment . . .

We've also said that we would need for ourselves the main operational part of the space station, that we would have to have assurance that we could go operational in the early '90s. We wouldn't give away a key system which if a country, for any reason, pulled out we would be left high and dry. But anything else is open, as far as we're concerned. And we would offer them participation on the station or on platforms associated with the station, or on other pieces or parts. If they want to add a module to the space station that could be a laboratory of their own, or if they want to add a module that could be a factory of their own—that's the other thing that we said to them: If you join in the development, we will give you assurance that you will have access to the station to use it. They can paint their flag on that piece or part that they own or that they share, and they will be guaranteed that they can use it on a continuing basis.

This one's different than any in the past. They not only will participate in development, but they'll own a share in it once it's operational, and they will continue to use it in the operational phase on the same basis that

we use it . . . We intend to add to it, and if they want to continue to do that . . . we'll welcome that, as well.

We're looking, in short, for a very major international collaboration, probably the biggest one that this agency has ever taken on, and maybe the biggest high-tech consortium for that kind of activity that's ever been run. That's in the tradition of this program. I can't think of a single program that NASA has had . . . that has not had some kind of international participation or collaboration . . .

On Soviet-American cooperation: We proposed to them early in the year an exchange from the Salyut space station to the Shuttle. For whatever reason, they rejected that out of hand. They weren't at all interested. I don't talk to [R.R.] Sagdeev, who's the head of their agency [the Space Research Institute.] I'm not allowed to. But the folks who do talk to Sagdeev say that he has indicated that they are quite interested and willing to collaborate in the future.

[In a brief interview with SGR following his talk, Beggs said the conversations with Sagdeev that he referred to involved NASA officials "who meet him at international forums." Beggs added, "I have no contact with Sagdeev, which is kind of sad, but it's the way things are these days."]

On proposals by Carl Sagan and others for a US-Soviet mission to Mars: If the Soviets would be interested in collaborating on that kind of a mission, it would make a very nice mission to collaborate on . . . There are lots of interesting ideas [for planetary exploration] and the Soviets have announced that they want to go to Mars. How eager they are to get there is hard to judge. They aren't doing some of the things that you need to do if you wanted to [get to Mars] very early . . . But if they're interested in doing that long-term, we'd be interested in doing it. But first we want to get that space station into operation, which provides . . . the infrastructure that makes it possible for you to do that mission. Right now, if I suggested that I was going to campaign for a mission to Mars, some friends over in OMB [Office of Management and Budget] would put a contract out on me.

© Science & Government Report, Inc., 1984

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Reif

Contributing Correspondents
Francois Seguier (Paris); Ros Herman (London)

Independently published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July & August. Annual subscription: Institutions, \$158.00 (two years, \$275.00). Information about bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second-class postage at Washington, D.C. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six months of publication date.

ISSN 0048-9581

... Civilian R&D Reoriented Toward Basic Science

(Continued from page 1)

and received for the National Science Foundation. The NSF share is a small slice of the R&D total—70 percent of which goes to the Defense Department. But NSF's fiscal fortunes often serve as a measure of White House affection for university-based science, and this Administration has lavished money on the parts of NSF that fit in with its defense-industrial concepts. Since 1982, the NSF budget has risen 50 percent, though the hapless social scientists and science educators have not only gone without growth but have actually gone downhill.

Apart from these and several other victims, however, the fiscal abundance is such that at a recent meeting of the White House Science Council's panel on universities, one university president openly scoffed at complaints of serious unmet financial needs in academic research. That's heretical, given the fact that academic science has boundless shopping lists. But conversation in Washington's science-policy circles is now occasionally marked by an astonishing theme: Could the scientific community make efficient use of an accelerated supply of money from Washington?

DOE's Ups and Downs

But what of the losers that have been produced while this overall growth in federal R&D spending has been going on? A large proportion of them were created by great cuts in applied-research and demonstration programs. The toll has been particularly heavy in the Department of Energy, which had experienced rapid growth through the Carter Administration's fascination with alternative energy sources. But DOE's declines in solar- and fossil-energy research programs have been accompanied by major increases in its support of basic-research programs. The budget that the Administration submitted for the current fiscal year presented the tradeoffs in plain words: Funding for fossil-fuel R&D would go down by \$57 million, along with cuts in other applied-research programs; at the same time, funding for basic energy sciences would go up by \$82 million.

Dividing the federal R&D budget between civilian and military, the net effect under Reagan has been a near-standstill in civilian R&D budgets and a doubling of R&D funds for defense. The numbers are striking. When the Carter Administration left office, civilian R&D was budgeted for \$15.3 billion, defense for \$17.8 billion. In the current fiscal year, civilian R&D has edged up slightly, to \$16 billion, while defense R&D has reached nearly \$35 billion. Besides undergoing inflationary losses, the civilian budget was turned topsy-turvy by the Reagan Administration as a result of those applied-research programs being cut off so that money could be diverted to basic research.

Apart from Congressionally amplified howls of pain from the national labs that were hit by these cuts, and some words of sympathy for the social scientists, the reductions generally occurred without much of a backlash from the victims. Where are they now? They haven't been tracked systematically, but some are known to have been redeployed to other projects; others apparently went off into the general economy to seek new work. The significant political fact, however, is that the losers in this R&D shuffle are not making political trouble for the Administration.

Given the sparse campaign record on R&D-related matters, the Reagan record must speak for itself while we go hunting for clues about Mondale's inclinations. The Democratic Party Platform offers some meaty stuff, but what's notable is that much of it could easily have fit into the Republican Platform without ideological strain. Thus, the Democratic Platform states, "We must encourage colleges and universities to train more scientists and engineers"—which is what the Reagan Administration has been doing with new programs at NSF. The Democratic Platform expresses support for a modern-day version of the Land Grant Act to "encourage the training of scientists and engineers," but offers no details, which is not unusual in the platform genre. And it goes on to state that "The private sector must also recognize its responsibility to join partnerships which strengthen our diverse public and private higher education system." The Reaganites have been saying that for years.

Under the heading "Innovation" and subheading "Research and Development," the Democratic Platform says that R&D is important for both high-tech and basic industries. And then it states objectives that sharply differentiate it from the Reagan Administration's R&D policies:

"Commercially Rated R&D"

"The United States," the Platform declares, "should revise its downward trend and increase the percentage of GNP devoted to commercially rated R&D as a long-term spending goal. We must be at the cutting edge, and we will not get there without cooperation between the government and the private sector. As Democrats, our goal is to increase civilian research and development in this country, to expand its commercial application, and to provide more industries with the opportunity to take advantage of it.

"At the national level," the Platform continues, "this means enhanced support for undergraduate and graduate training in science, mathematics, and engineering; increased support to refurbish and modernize university

(Continued on page 4)

... A Big Difference on Regulatory Agencies

(Continued from page 3)

research laboratories; increased support for the National Science Foundation and similar efforts; and a commitment to civilian research and development"

The section concludes with "The Democratic Party will encourage and support centers that provide for co-operation of academic and entrepreneurial excellence, thereby strengthening our scientific and technological resources and creating tomorrow's jobs."

Though a lot of that Democratic Platform language dovetails with the Reagan Administration's aims of using academic research as an intellectual booster and training ground for industry, there is a major difference. While the Administration has eviscerated the federal civilian R&D budget, the Democrats urge more money for "commercially rated R&D as a long-term spending goal." (The term "commercially rated," a newcomer on the Washington science-policy scene, isn't defined, but apparently is intended to mean R&D aimed at making money.) Thus, the Platform strongly implies that the Democrats favor at least some restoration of those applied-research programs that were eliminated in favor of basic research. Left untouched is the question of where the money is to come from in a Democratic Administration dedicated to thrift, and whether the restoration of funds for applied research would mean less for basic research.

Soviet-American Relations

Looking for other science-related areas in which the Reagan-Mondale policy differences are sharply delineated, it seems clear that Mondale would reverse, or at least reduce, the present Administration's prohibition on high-level scientific contacts with the Soviets; that, in turn, would ease the way for a resumption of bilateral scientific collaboration.

The extent to which American scientific officialdom has been under orders to ignore the Soviets is not generally realized, but the past three and a half years have seen a virtual cutoff of previously well-established, and often congenial, relations between the chiefs of American research agencies and their Soviet counterparts.

Presidential Science Adviser George A. Keyworth II has not visited the Soviet Union during his three-and-a-half years in office, nor is he known to have received, socially or otherwise, any senior Soviet science officials. In a departure from the decorum that usually attends international science relations, Keyworth openly scoffs at Soviet scientific quality (see Page 6), and has done so on several occasions. (In this regard, his views match those of other science officials; the difference is little or no gap between what Keyworth says in private and in public.)

Though the President has softened his words about the Soviets and has expressed support for closer ties, the State Department recently blocked acceptance of an invitation for the Director of NIH to visit the Soviet Union. NASA Administrator James M. Beggs frankly acknowledges that "I'm not allowed" to talk to the Soviets (see Page 2), and Edward Knapp, who recently resigned as Director of NSF, held that office for nearly two years without meeting any Soviet officials of similar scientific rank.

Shunning the Russians

The unwholesomeness of this stance toward the huge Soviet scientific enterprise is just plain foolish, if not dangerous, as can be heard in comments that sometimes seep out. Thus, new to the job and perhaps not yet tuned in to the Administration's policy of shunning Soviet science, Erich Bloch, the new NSF Director, recently said, "We need to know what they're doing and the best way is to talk to them."

Mondale has said he would rapidly move in that direction on general matters, and it's a safe bet that, as in Nixon's openings to the Soviet Union and China, scientific contacts would be in the vanguard.

Another science-related area in which the two candidates differ sharply is in the financial support and ideological latitude they would provide for the flock of public-protection agencies that heavily rely on science and technology for carrying on their work. The Reagan record on this score is blatantly appalling, as was clearly spelled out last year when long-simmering scandals at the Environmental Protection Agency finally broke into public view. Political necessity then dictated the dumping of EPA Administrator Anne Burford and nearly a score of her senior associates at the agency. But the President, unfailingly loyal to his faithful supporters, later tried to resurrect Burford by appointing her to the chairmanship of an environmental advisory committee. The ousted EPA Administrator is clearly Mr. Reagan's kind of environmentalist.

The Reaganite war against government regulation extends far beyond EPA. The Administration has proposed abolition of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and, failing that, has crimped its activities. The Occupational Safety and Health Administration has been defanged, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has consistently been more attentive to manufacturers' profits than to motorists' safety.

When it comes to the simple matter of generous support for science and freedom for scientists to spend it as they choose, there really isn't much difference between Reagan and Mondale. The differences appear on the issues of the uses of science—and they are very substantial differences.—DSG

Keyworth Rakes Social Sciences, USSR, Etc.

Interest has been expressed in science-policy circles about the acerbic comments that Presidential Science Adviser George A. Keyworth II made before an audience of about 30 in response to questions and comments following a routine talk ("Is Government Science and Technology Meeting the Needs of Industry?") he gave September 24 at the Woodrow Wilson Center, in Washington. Underestimating readers' interest in this performance, SGR (Vol. XIV, No. 16, In Brief) merely reported his reference to the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) program as "money down the sewer"—which has elicited worried inquiries from SBIR beneficiaries. But there was more, all recorded on SGR tape, from which the following excerpts are taken:

•

On the sharp cuts in NSF social-science programs ordered by the Reagan Administration in early 1981, shortly before Keyworth's appointment: I think great courage and wisdom was executed in squashing the daylight out of the National Science Foundation's social-science programs, as well as the science and math programs, for a very simple reason: In terms of sheer quality, they rated phenomenally low. They were programs that had been driven by a host of small desires in Congress and small desires in constituencies. There was absolutely no sense of direction in any of those programs . . . There is a lot of important work within the social sciences, and I think you are seeing a rebuilding of the [NSF] programs. But they're being built anew . . . There are a number of areas that needed a renaissance—the cognitive sciences, for example, and we're seeing it . . .

•

On NIH research programs and their relevance to industry: In terms of excellence, [NIH research is] a gem. But NIH sits in an agency, [the Department of] Health and Human Services, with a traditional responsibility that is solely related to developing the knowledge that industry, prior to a complex regulatory environment, would naturally pick up. We find ourselves in 1984 with a technology that goes far beyond the health industry. I refer to agriculture, but it also goes into materials, chemicals, even . . . bio-mining, a very much proven technology, in fact. So, here's a brand new technology, akin to what the transistor looked like nearly 30 years ago. And yet NIH is virtually prevented . . . by their own perception . . . from accepting any cooperative involvement with government, in training, in moving technology into industry, and in trying to direct some of the educational environment that we find in our universities into some parallelism with what the new bio-engineering and pharmaceutical industries require. There's a mismatch there, and to me it's part of our lack of a competitive configuration that we have across the board . . . We spend an enormous amount of money at

SBIR: "Down the Sewer"

Science Adviser Keyworth's harsh comments about the Small Business Innovation Research program were delivered in response to hostile remarks about SBIR from a member of the audience at his Wilson Center talk. Speaking about NIH in general, but referring specifically to the National Cancer Institute, Keyworth's interlocutor—apparently an NIH staff member—said, "On the one side, we have many good applications which are being turned down . . . and on the other side, we have applications which, by most criteria, would not be acceptable, and they're now being funded just because they're SBIR."

Obviously in sympathy with the commentator, Keyworth replied: "At the risk of irritating somebody, I thought the SBIR program was one of the most remarkable feats of distorted logic I've ever seen. They had a tiny program at the National Science Foundation of \$5 million a year from which people could genuinely pick some gems . . .

"So, a good idea should be translated into a great idea. Multiply it by a factor—add a few zeros, and it ought to be great. Well, I think this was very widely predictable. The worse thing is that . . . it's what people call a 'set-aside' program. It's a cowardly tax. If you don't want to pay the penalties of [making a difficult] decision, you put a set-aside . . . Somebody, someplace pays for it. The grant process pays . . ."

The audience member then interjected that while 30 percent of approved applications from academics were being funded by NIH, the funding rate for approved SBIR applications was "80 to 90 percent."

Keyworth replied: "That's money down the sewer, for most of it."

NIH that should ensure American industry's competitive edge . . .

Normally, when a field of science becomes incredibly exciting, like what happened in the fields of optics, or atomic physics, or when the laser was invented, tremendous excitement is generated and a tremendous number of young people are drawn into the field. To me, far and away, the most exciting field of science today is neurobiology. Yet, very little attention or even opportunities exist to allow the research that is of interest in that field to be reflected to our youth. In other words, research is pursued largely for its research priorities and research interest and only marginal attention is paid to the kind of talent that we train to exploit the opportunities in that

(Continued on page 6)

... Says Cooperation Yields Few Benefits

(Continued from page 5)

field . . . For example, if you were to attempt to hire a bioengineer—an expert in bioprocesses, taking recombinant technology up to large scale—where would you go to find one? They're practically not training them . . . There is little attention being paid within NIH to the research laboratory as a training environment, which is half the traditional reason for supporting basic research; that, to me, is one of the fundamental problems with NIH. You can support all the wonderful research in the world . . . but there is less attention put at NIH than in virtually any other agency in our own government to put that science to use. And that's what I find so frustrating.

On the support and use of basic research: Real growth [in federal support of basic research] will continue for a long time . . . The question is how do you put that strength [in basic research] to good use. We are all proud of the fact that American scientists receive 70 percent of the Nobel Prizes . . . and there's every sign of that continuing . . . But what good does it do? If you're hungry, having a Renoir on the walls at home doesn't help a whole lot. The question is how do we draw upon that talent.

On Soviet-American scientific cooperation: I think the benefits to American science and scientists have been very, very small, compared to the benefits in the opposite direction. We have to ask ourselves . . . are the benefits very large for US science compared to the difference between what the USSR is getting from us anyway, versus what they get [through cooperative programs]? Even then, I think they're small. I think there's very little that we can gain. The Soviets are extremely effective in incorporating the fruits of other societies. Now, the Soviets do have some absolutely first-class minds . . . But I don't think that the course of progress in the West will be very altered with or without Soviet science being involved.

There are some notable exceptions. The Tokamak is a Soviet concept for a fusion reactor [undergoing tests in the US]. I often wonder if we wouldn't be better off if we hadn't [adopted the concept] and had pursued other avenues of fusion. But the positive examples are few and far between . . .

I traveled a lot in the Soviet Union during the '70s. I have access to virtually all the intelligence information about the state of Soviet technology, and I think that what we lose [in the absence of cooperative programs] is much less than what we would lose if we did not have . . . access to England, for example. So, to put it in a context, of course we lose some things. I think they're negligible in importance. I think there are very few areas where American industry lacks a technology

Campus Secrecy Issue Recedes

The euphemistically titled "export-control" issue seems to be fading away as far as its application to university-based research is concerned.

The Defense Department, long a house divided on whether security restrictions should be applied to unclassified but "sensitive" research that it supports in academic laboratories, has fallen back to the position that research should either be classified or unclassified. That line harmonizes with the stance taken by university representatives on the DoD-University Forum, where security rules and other matters are regularly chewed over by university presidents and senior Defense officials.

The academics, keen for Defense's growing budget for support of university research, have argued that classified research, whatever the label, is prohibited and provocative on many campuses, and that Defense should not try to squirm around that fact by conjuring "sensitive" as a more acceptable category.

Though White House Science Adviser George A. Keyworth II has been assuring academic audiences that security is a dead issue on campus, there's life in the question of whether it would remain so in a second Reagan Administration. Soon to leave Defense is Under Secretary Richard DeLauer, who led the fight against the Pentagon's zealots—many of whom are expected to remain on board.

because the expertise is in the Soviet Union . . . Titanium-hulled submarines are the only example we know . . .

There are certainly some positive signs on the part of the Soviet Union to somewhat thaw the relationship between us. If that occurs, I expect you'll see science and technology cooperation be part of that thaw. I don't think there's a likelihood that it will be the other way around . . . I don't think you'll see science and technology as a leading means to encourage that thaw.

On the State Department blocking acceptance of an invitation for the Director of NIH to visit the USSR (SGR Vol. XIV, No. 15): Their requests for the NIH Director [to visit]—that sort of things happens constantly. I would even say that for the first time in while, I agree with the State Department.

On reports that funding for NIH allows support of only 30 percent of approved applications: Forty percent, worldwide—I've discussed this with my peers in other countries—is getting into the mediocre range. I think 40 percent is generally deemed to be too large a fraction of already filtered grants . . .

In Print: Here's a Flock of New Publications

Labor Market Conditions for Engineers: Is There a Shortage? Proceedings of a symposium last February at the National Academy of Sciences, this slim volume presents arguments and speculations in support of yes, no, and perhaps, thus adding confusion to an already murky subject.

(159 pages, no charge, NAS, Office of Scientific and Engineering Personnel, 2101 Constitution Ave. Nw., Washington, DC 20418.)

Physicians for the Twenty-First Century, report by a panel of the Association of American Medical Colleges, replete with the usual criticisms: too much science at the pre-med level, too much memorization in medical courses, too much reliance on the lecture format, etc.—all of which has been said before, with little effect, though the panel notes that 10 American and 2 Canadian medical schools have instituted some reforms.

(48 pages, no charge, AAMC, Publications Orders, Suite 200, One DuPont Circle, Washington, DC 20036.)

Applications of Anomalous Phenomena, proceedings of an apparently deadly serious symposium on clairvoyance, metal bending, "remote viewing," and other "psi" peculiarities. What's notable about this event, which took place last November, is its support by a division of a high-tech conglomerate, Kaman Tempo, part of the Kaman Corporation, and the references to attendance by unnamed "senior scientists and civilian and military managers (who) are mindful of the special risks involved at the present time in being openly associated with almost any relationship with psychic phenomena."

(514 pages, \$27.50, Kaman Tempo, Suite 500, 2560 Huntington Drive, Alexandria, Va. 22303, attn: Scott Jones.)

The American Health Care System, 1984, a compact collection of data, assembled by the American Medical Association, traces decades of national health-care expenditures and utilization, medical education and employment, vital statistics, etc.

(83 pages, \$12.95, Order Department, OP-259, AMA, PO Box 10946, Chicago, Ill. 60610.)

Cutting Edge Technologies, proceedings of a symposium at the 1983 annual meeting of the National Academy of Engineering, includes papers on biotechnology, structural materials, and transportation technology.

(192 pages, \$18.95, National Academy Press, NAS 2101 Constitution Ave. Nw., Washington, DC 20418.)

Effects of Information Technology on Financial Services Systems, a big report, three years in the works, by

the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment on the electronic blitz in moving money; cautions that organizational changes are coming too fast to allow reliable forecasts, but notes that the existing regulatory framework is out of date; also that the changes sometimes are disadvantageous for consumers.

(282 pages, \$7.50, GPO Stock No. 052-003-00961-7, Superintendent of Documents, USGPO, Washington, DC 20402.)

National Academy of Sciences' Reports on Diet and Health—Are They Credible and Consistent?, report by the General Accounting Office on NAS' 1980 study *Toward Healthful Diets*, which was widely assailed as a pro-industry snowjob, and its 1982 followup, *Diet, Nutrition, and Cancer*, which was intended to mend the damage. The GAO inquiry, undertaken at the request of irate and puzzled Congressmen, presented a rare opportunity for a serious examination of the NAS' report-making processes, but the inquiry appears to have been superficial, and the conclusions fairly trite, e.g., "The reports represent two schools of thought . . ." Only passing reference is made to the crucial role of the previous Academy president in initiating the first report.

(50 pages plus appendixes, no charge, USGAO, Document Handling and Information Services Facility, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, Md. 20760; tel. 202/275-6241.)

SGR Binders for Sale

Looseleaf binders that can accommodate two years' issues of *Science & Government Report* are available for \$6.95 each. Order from SGR, PO Box 5226, Washington, DC 20015. Please send payment with order.

Subscription Form

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription; ☐ Check enclosed
☐ Enter my subscription; ☐ Please bill

Institutional subscribers: one year, \$158.00 ☐; two years, \$275.00 ☐
(Overseas airmail, \$25.00 per year additional.)

Name _____

Address _____

Zip _____

NIH Funds Five Alzheimer's Research Centers

Under pressure from the hard-driving Alzheimer's lobby, the National Institutes of Health has got off relatively cheaply by setting aside a mere \$3.5 million for the first year of programs at five new university-based Alzheimer's Disease Research Centers.

The program and money, coming through the National Institute of Aging, were announced by Margaret Heckler, Secretary of Health and Human Services, in a press conference October 1 at Harvard Medical School, which is one of the recipients, in tandem with Massachusetts General Hospital. The others are the Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions, the Mt. Sinai School of Medicine, UC San Diego, and the University of Southern California.

Creation of the Centers was recommended by the Alzheimer's Disease Task Force, which Heckler appointed last year. An HHS press release on the program notes that it is to be multidisciplinary, and states that a voluntary group, the Alzheimer's Disease and Related Disorders Association "was the first to recommend the multidisciplinary approach to Alzheimer research."

The NIH high command is politely silent about this latest success of the so-called disease-of-the-month approach to biomedical-research programming, but it is dismayed by the process which puts the budget up for grabs by lobbying. Congress, however, likes NIH to be attentive to distraught constituents, and it re-

wards Bethesda with huge budget increases—some 15 percent in this tight budget year.

Meanwhile, the NIH management sees the possibility of some new help against the lobbying groups. As spelled out by NIH Director James B. Wyngaarden (SGR Vol. XIV, No. 15), the White House Science Office—which is seeking a bigger say in NIH affairs—is regarded as a possible foil against Congressional intrusions. And then the Institute of Medicine is conducting a major policy study of NIH. The final report will argue that basic biomedical research is the surest way to cures now beyond medical reach, and that efforts specifically targeted against poorly understood ailments are misguided.

NIH Library Head Sworn In

Donald A. B. Lindberg was sworn in October 11 as Director of the National Library of Medicine. The Library, part of the National Institutes of Health, is the world's largest health-sciences library and is a pioneer in computerized information retrieval.

Lindberg previously was Director of the Information Science Group and Professor of Pathology at the University of Missouri School of Medicine. He succeeds Martin M. Cummings, who retired last year after heading the Library for nearly 20 years.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid
at Washington, D.C.

XEROX-UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS
300 N. ZEEB RD.
ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

